UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/738,597	12/15/2000	Amir Lahat	2681/OIO70	1236

25937 7590 06/01/2004

ZARETSKY & ASSOCIATES PC
8753 W. RUNION DR.
PEORIA, AZ 85382-6412

EXAMINER	
JUNTIMA, NITTAYA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2663	5

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/738,597	LAHAT, AMIR	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nittaya Juntima	2663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 December 2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-47* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-47* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 December 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *Paper no. 2*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Oath/Declaration

1. Applicant has not given a post office address anywhere in the application papers as required by 37 CFR 1.33(a), which was in effect at the time of filing of the oath or declaration. A statement over applicant's signature providing a complete post office address is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-12, 14, 16, 17-18, 23-29, and 39 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- in claim 1, line 16, "and" should be added after a semicolon;

line 10, "an Ethernet" should be changed to "said Ethernet;"

- in claims 2, 23, and 39, line 2, "the" should be changed to "a," and "and" should be added before "STM-4;"

- in claim 18, line 5, "an" should be changed to "the;"

- in claims 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 18, 24, 25, 26, 27, "is operative to" should be changed, e.g. "is operative to retrieve" in line 7 of claim 1 should be changed to "for retrieving" and "is operative to encapsulate" in lines 1-2 of claim 3 should be changed to "encapsulates" in order to put the claims in a better form

- in claims 1, 7, 8, 16, 17, 18, 28, and 29, the limitation "adapted for" and "adapted to" should be changed, e.g. " an ingress buffer adapted for storing" in line 3 of in the claim should be changed to "an ingress buffer for storing." It has been held that the recitation that an element

"adapted for" performing a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. In *re Hutchinson*, 69 USPQ 138.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-17 and 32-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, line 5, the limitation "an egress buffer for storing Ethernet frames after segmentation into TDM stream" is vague and indefinite. It cannot be determined from the claim language as how an egress buffer stores Ethernet frames after segmentation info TDM streams as the specification, pg. 20, lines 22-24, defines an egress Tx buffer 426 for storing TDM streams after received Ethernet frames are segmented. See also lines 1-12 of the claim. Therefore, the claim is vague and indefinite. The office is treating this limitation as "an egress buffer for storing TDM data after segmentation from Ethernet frames."

Further, claim 1 recites the limitation "said Ethernet interface" in line 9 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The office is treating this limitation as "an Ethernet interface."

In claim 2, line 1, the limitation "said TDM stream" lacks antecedent basis. The office is treating this limitation as "said plurality of TDM streams"

In claim 12, line 2, the limitation "calculates a Cyclic Redundancy Check (CRC) code before packaging said TDM data into Ethernet frames" is vague and indefinite. It cannot be determined from the claim language as how a CRC code can be calculated before packaging the TDM data into Ethernet frames, see specification, pg. 21, lines 6-16 and pg. 31, lines 13-19 and Fig. 18. Therefore, the claim is vague and indefinite. The office is treating this limitation as "calculates a Cyclic Redundancy Check (CRC) code when packaging said TDM data into Ethernet frames"

In claims 13 and 30, lines 5-6, the limitation "said RTP packet, UDP packet, IP packet and Ethernet frame" lacks antecedent basis. The office is treating this limitation as "said RTP packets, UDP packets, IP packets and Ethernet frames."

In claims 15 and 31, line 4, the limitation "said Ethernet frame" lacks antecedent basis. The office is treating this limitation as "an Ethernet frame."

In claim 32, line 10, the limitation "said TDM streams" lacks antecedent basis. The office is treating this limitation as "said TDM data."

In claim 46, lines 6-7, the limitation "said RTP packet, UDP packet, IP packet and Ethernet frame" lacks antecedent basis. The office is treating this limitation as "said RTP packets, UDP packets, IP packets and Ethernet frames."

In claim 47, the limitation "said Ethernet frame" lacks antecedent basis. The office is treating this limitation as "an Ethernet frame."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. **Claims 32, 39-41, and 43-45** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cox et al. (USPN 6,459,709 B1).

Per **claim 32**, as shown in Fig. 6, Cox et al. teach receiving ***TDM stream data*** (E1 stream data) from ***a plurality of TDM ports*** (trunk interface logic ports 510 in Fig. 5), assembling ***Ethernet frames*** (Ethernet packets) from said received TDM stream data, forwarding said assembled Ethernet frames to ***said Ethernet network*** (Ethernet network, i.e. high speed data network 440 in Fig. 4) via ***an Ethernet interface*** (100 Base Tx port controller 630) connected thereto, receiving Ethernet frames (Ethernet packets) from said Ethernet network, extracting ***TDM data*** (E1 data) from said received Ethernet frames and generating ***TDM streams*** (E1

streams) therefrom, and forwarding said TDM data to an appropriate TDM port (a specific port) in a synchronous manner. See col. 14, ll 50-65 and 15, ll 1-38.

Per **claim 39**, Cox et al. teach that ***said plurality of TDM ports*** (trunk interface logic ports 510 in Fig. 5) comprises E1 port interface (col. 14, ll 54-57).

Per **claim 40**, Cox et al. teach the step of encapsulating data from ***a plurality of TDM ports*** (an output port of switch A connecting to multiplexer A via link A-to-B 411 and an input port of multiplexer A 420 in Fig. 4) into ***a single Ethernet frame*** (an Ethernet packet containing data destined to the same destination switch) (col. 15, ll 1-20).

Per **claim 41**, Cox et al. teach the step of encapsulating data from ***a plurality of TDM frames*** (two E1 frames from a trunk interface logic 510 in Fig. 5) corresponding to ***a single TDM port*** (a trunk interface logic 510 in Fig. 5) into ***a single Ethernet frame*** (an Ethernet packet) (col. 15, ll 1-20).

Per **claim 43**, Cox et al. teach that the step of segmenting ***an Ethernet frame*** (an Ethernet packet) into ***a plurality of TDM frames*** (two-E1 frames destined to a specific port) corresponding to ***a single TDM port*** (a specific port, e.g. a trunk interface logic 510 in Fig. 5) (col. 15, ll 23-38, see also ll 9-13 and Fig. 7).

Per **claim 44**, Cox et al. teach storing ***TDM data*** (E1 data) received from ***a plurality of TDM ports*** (trunk interface logics 510 in Fig. 5) in accordance with ***specific port based parameters*** (specific port based parameters are not defined, read on destination switches A-N corresponding to each trunk interface logic, Figs. 4-6, col. 14, ll 6-23 and col. 15, ll 1-38).

Per **claim 45**, Cox et al. teach storing ***TDM data*** (E1 data) received from ***a plurality of TDM ports*** (trunk interface logics 510 in Fig. 5) in accordance with ***specific time based***

parameters (specific time based parameters are not defined, read on 250 microseconds, Figs. 4-6, col. 14, ll 6-23 and col. 15, ll 1-38).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14, 16-25, 27-29, and 33-38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox et al. (USPN 6,459,709 B1).

Per **claims 1 and 33-34**, as shown in Fig. 6, Cox et al. teach the following:

storing ***TDM data*** (E1/T1 data) before encapsulation into Ethernet frames (E1/T1 data is stored in each transmit queue logic 601 before encapsulation, col. 14, ll 41-47, 50-65),

storing TDM data after segmentation from Ethernet frames (E1/T1 data is stored in each receive queue logic 602 after segmentation, col. 14, ll 41-47, 50-65),

encapsulation means (application envelope logic 610 and UDP/IP/MAC prefix logic 620) for retrieving TDM data, assembling Ethernet frames and forwarding the assembled Ethernet frames to ***an Ethernet interface*** (100 Base Tx port controller 630) (col. 14, ll 54-65 and col. 15, ll 1-20),

segmentation means (application envelope logic 610 and UDP/IP/MAC prefix logic 620) for receiving Ethernet frames from an Ethernet interface, extracting TDM data therefrom and storing said TDM data (col. 15, ll 23-35), and

a processor (a PowerPCO processor card) for receiving TDM data from ***a plurality of TDM ports*** (trunk interface logic ports 510 in Fig. 5), storing said TDM data in accordance with output Ethernet frames (E1 data is stored according to its destination switch corresponding to the destination info. in a MAC header, see also Fig. 5), and retrieving TDM data and generating ***a plurality of synchronous TDM data streams*** (outgoing E1 streams from the receive queue logics 602 to trunk interface logic ports 510) (col. 14, ll 6-23 and col. 15, ll 1-38).

Although Cox et al. teach transmit queue logics 601 and receive queue logics 602 for storing TDM data before encapsulation and for storing TDM data after segmentation from Ethernet frames, respectively, Cox et al. fail to teach the ingress buffer and the egress buffer as recited in the claim.

However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify, e.g. group, ingress buffers (transmit queue logics 601) and egress buffers (receive queue logics 602) of Cox et al. into one ingress buffer and one egress buffer, respectively, since such modification involves only routine skill in the art.

Per **claims 2** and **23,** Cox et al. teach that ***said plurality of TDM streams*** (outgoing E1 streams from the receive queue logics 602 to trunk interface logic ports 510) comprises E1 (col. 15, ll 35-38).

Per **claims 3** and **24**, Cox et al. teach that ***said encapsulation means*** (application envelope logic 610 and UDP/IP/MAC prefix logic 620) encapsulates data from ***a plurality of TDM ports*** (an output port of switch A connecting to multiplexer A via link A-to-B 411 and an input port of multiplexer A 420 in Fig. 4) into ***a single Ethernet frame*** (an Ethernet packet containing data destined to the same destination switch) (col. 15, ll 1-20).

Per claims 4 and 25, Cox et al. teach that ***said encapsulation means*** (application envelope logic 610 and UDP/IP/MAC prefix logic 620) encapsulates data from ***a plurality of TDM frames*** (two E1 frames from a trunk interface logic 510 in Fig. 5) corresponding to ***a single TDM port*** (a trunk interface logic 510 in Fig. 5) into ***a single Ethernet frame*** (an Ethernet packet) (col. 15, ll 1-20).

Per claims 6 and 27, Cox et al. teach that ***said segmentation means*** (application envelope logic 610 and UDP/IP/MAC prefix logic 620) segments ***an Ethernet frame*** (an Ethernet packet) into ***a plurality of TDM frames*** (two-E1 frames destined to a specific port) corresponding to ***a single TDM port*** (a specific port, e.g. a trunk interface logic 510 in Fig. 5) (col. 15, ll 23-38, see also ll 9-13 and Fig. 7).

Per claims 7 and 28, Cox et al. teach that ***said processor*** (a PowerPCO processor card) stores ***TDM data*** (E1 data) received from ***a plurality of TDM ports*** (trunk interface logics 510 in Fig. 5) in accordance with ***specific port based parameters*** (specific port based parameters are not defined, read on destination switches A-N corresponding to each trunk interface logic, Figs. 4-6, col. 14, ll 6-23 and col. 15, ll 1-38).

Per claims 8 and 29, Cox et al. teach that ***said processor*** (a PowerPCO processor card) stores ***TDM data*** (E1 data) received from ***a plurality of TDM ports*** (trunk interface logics 510 in Fig. 5) in accordance with ***specific time based parameters*** (specific time based parameters are not defined, read on 250 microseconds, Figs. 4-6, col. 14, ll 6-23 and col. 15, ll 1-38).

Per claim 9, Cox et al. teach that ***said encapsulation means*** (application envelope logic 610 and UDP/IP/MAC prefix logic 620) receives ***TDM data*** (E1 data) on ***a plurality of constant***

synchronous serial bit streams (E1 streams from transmit queue logics 601 in Fig. 6, col. 15, ll 1-20).

Per **claim 10**, Cox et al. fail to teach that ***said encapsulation means*** (application envelope logic 610 and UDP/IP/MAC prefix logic 620) performs encryption on the TDM data (E1 data) before packaging the TDM data into Ethernet frames. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include encryption into the teaching of Cox et al. such that the encapsulation means would perform encryption on the TDM data (E1 data) before packaging the TDM data into Ethernet frames. The motivation/suggestion to do so would have been to provide data privacy and security which are the well known benefits of data encryption.

Per **claim 11**, Cox et al. fail to teach that ***said encapsulation means*** (application envelope logic 610 and UDP/IP/MAC prefix logic 620) performs compression on the TDM data (E1 data) before packaging the TDM data into Ethernet frames. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include compression into the teaching of Cox et al. such that the encapsulation means would perform compression on the TDM data (E1 data) before packaging the TDM data into Ethernet frames. The motivation/suggestion to do so would have been to save time and capacity which are the well known benefits of data compression.

Per **claim 12**, it is inherent that the ***encapsulation means*** (application envelope logic 610 and UDP/IP/MAC prefix logic 620) must calculate a CRC code (checksum) when packaging the TDM data (E1 data) into Ethernet frames because a UDP header contains a checksum which uses CRC code (col. 15, ll 1-20).

Per claim 14, Cox et al. teach that ***said encapsulation means*** (application envelope logic 610 and UDP/IP/MAC prefix logic 620) forwards Ethernet frames towards ***an Ethnernet MAC device*** (network interface logic 530 in Fig. 5, col. 15, ll 18-22 and col. 14, ll 18-23).

Per claim 16, it is inherent that ***the processor*** (a PowerPCO processor card, col. 14, ll 14-23) must perform rate adaptation between ***a plurality of TDM ports*** (trunk interface logic ports 510 in Fig. 5) and ***an egress buffer interface*** (network interface logic 530 in Fig. 5) because the egress buffer interface is communicating with the router (430 in Fig. 4) at a data rate which is much higher than the data rate of the TDM ports, therefore, rate adaptation must be performed to provide data transmission between the TDM ports and the egress buffer interface.

Per claim 17, Cox et al. teach that ***said processor*** (a PowerPCO processor card) forwards ***TDM frames*** (TDM frames destined to the same switch as shown in Fig. 7) to ***appropriate TDM ports*** (a specific port) as a constant synchronous serial bit stream (col. 14, ll 6-23 and col. 15, ll 23-38, see also ll 9-13).

Per claim 18, Cox et al. teach the limitations as recited in claim 1 and the following additional limitations: ***a plurality of TDM port interfaces*** (output ports of switch A connecting to multiplexer A in Fig. 4) coupled to ***a plurality of TDM ports*** (trunk interface logic ports 510 in Fig. 5), each TDM port receives ***a constant synchronous serial TDM bit stream*** (E1 stream), and ***at least one Ethernet interface*** (100 Base Tx port controller 630 in Fig. 6) coupled to the ***Ethernet network*** (high speed data network 440 in Fig. 4).

Per claims 19 and 35, Cox et al. fail to teach that ***the Ethernet interface*** (100 Base Tx port controller 630 in Fig. 6) comprises a 10Base-T Ethernet interface. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include a 10Base-T Ethernet interface into the Ethernet

interface of Cox et al. in order to accommodate small traffic valume, e.g. a few E1s, at minimum operation cost.

Per **claims 20** and **36**, as shown in Fig. 6, Cox et al. teach that ***the Ethernet interface*** (100 Base Tx port controller 630) comprises a 100Base-T Ethernet interface.

Per **claims 21-22** and **37-38**, Cox et al. fail to teach that ***the Ethernet interface*** (100 Base Tx port controller 630 in Fig. 6) comprises a 1000Base-T Ethernet interface/10Gigabit Ethernet interface. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include a 1000Base-T Ethernet interface/10Gigabit Ethernet interface into the Ethernet interface of Cox et al. in order to guarantee quality of service and timely transmission of network packets as taught by Cox et al. (col. 13, ll 26-38).

7. **Claims 5, 26,** and **42** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox et al. (USPN 6,459,709 B1) in view of Iliev et al. (USPN 5,459,720).

Per **claims 5, 26**, and **42**, Cox et al. teach that ***the segmentation means*** (application envelope logic 610 and UDP/IP/MAC prefix logic 620) segments an Ethernet frame into a TDM stream corresponding to a TDM port (Figs. 5 and 6, col. 15, ll 23-38), but fail to teach that said segmentation means segments an Ethernet frame into a plurality of TDM streams, each TDM stream corresponding to a different TDM port.

However, in Fig. 10D, Iliev et al. teach in an analogous art, i.e. using inverse multiplexing by a local switched network access system 100 (a segmentation means) to segment packet 1000 (an Ethernet frame containing 3 TDM streams as payload) into sub-packets 1004, 1005, and 1006 (3 TDM streams) over channels 117, 188, and 199 (channels connected to

different TDM ports) in order to improve terminal response time by decreasing transmission delay of the entire packet (col. 9, ll 27-39).

Given the teaching of Iliev et al., it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the teaching of Cox et al. such that the segmentation means would segment an Ethernet frame into a plurality of TDM streams, each TDM stream corresponding to a different TDM port. The suggestion/motivation to do would have been to improve terminal response time by decreasing transmission delay of the entire Ethernet packet as taught by Iliev et al. (col. 9, ll 36-39).

8. **Claims 13, 15, 30-31,** and **46-47** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox et al. (USPN 6,459,709 B1) in view of Schoo et al. (USPN 6,304,574 B1).

Per **claims 13, 30, and 46,** Cox et al. teach ***means for packaging TDM stream data into UDP packets, then into IP packets, and finally into Ethernet frames*** (application envelope logic 610), and ***means for generating appropriate header information for the UDP and IP packets and Ethernet frames*** (UDP/IP/MAC prefix logic 620). See col. 15, ll 1-20.

However, Cox et al. fail to teach that means for packaging also packages TDM stream data into RTP packets and means for generating also generates appropriate header information for the RTP packets.

However, as shown in Fig. 18, Schoo et al. teach packaging TDM stream data (inbound TDM data) into RTP packets (col. 19, ll 3-12) and generating appropriate header (RTP header) information for the RTP packets (col. 19, ll 3-12, see also col. 13, ll 52-56).

Given the teaching of Schoo et al., it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate packaging TDM stream data into RTP packets and generating appropriate header information for the RTP packets into the teaching of Cox et al. such that means for packaging would package TDM stream data into RTP packets and means for generating would generate appropriate header information for the RTP packets as recited in the claim. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to allow for monitoring of the data delivery and to provide control and identification functionality as taught by Schoo et al. (col. 13, ll 39-44).

Per claims 15, 31, and 47, Cox et al. teach ***means*** (application envelope logic 610) for extracting TDM stream data from ***the contents of*** (payload) a UDP packet and IP packet extracted from an Ethernet frame and ***means*** (application envelope logic 610) for storing the TDM data in ***the egress buffer*** (one of the receive queue logics A in Fig. 6). See col. 15, ll 23-38.

However, Cox et al. fail to teach that means for extracting extracts TDM stream data from the contents of a RTP packet and means for storing stores the TDM data in the egress buffer in accordance with the contents of RTP header information.

As shown in Fig. 18, Schoo et al. teach extracting TDM stream data from the contents of a RTP packet (col. 19, ll 13-19) and RTP header information (col. 13, ll 39-41).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include extracting TDM stream data from the contents of a RTP packet of Schoo et al. into the means for extracting of Cox et al.

The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to allow for monitoring of the data delivery and to provide control and identification functionality as taught by Schoo et al. (col. 13, ll 39-44).

Moreover, it would have been to one skilled in the art to modify the combined teaching of Cox et al. and Schoo et al. such that means for storing would store the TDM data in the egress buffer in accordance with the contents of RTP header information. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to enable the egress buffer to store the queued TDM data according to its sequence number which is a well known RTP header information in order to preserve the order of the TDM data.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nittaya Juntima whose telephone number is 703-306-4821. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 A.M - 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau Nguyen can be reached on 703-308-5340. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nittaya Juntima
May 21, 2004